

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 remain in the present application. Applicant respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the amendments and arguments set forth below.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-19 and 21

Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-19 and 21 are rejected in the present Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being rendered obvious by United States Patent Number 6,029,141 to Bezos et al. (hereafter referred to as "Bezos"), in view of United States Patent Number 6,643,663 to Dabney et al. (hereafter referred to as "Dabney"). Applicant has reviewed the cited references and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-19 and 21 are not rendered obvious by Bezos in view of Dabney for the following reasons.

Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner to independent Claim 1 that recites a method for an e-commerce storefront management user interface to enable efficient updating of the Web pages of the storefront comprising (emphasis added):

accessing a Web page out of a plurality of Web pages of an e-commerce Web site;
 submitting log in information to the Web site to enable editing thereof;
 invoking a web page editor having a graphical user interface for editing the Web page;
 selecting an item on the Web page to modify;
 editing the item on the Web page;
 submitting the edited item to the Web site; and
 receiving an updated version of the Web page to view and verify the edited item.

Independent Claims 8 and 15 recite limitations similar to independent Claim 1. Claims 2-5, 7, 9-12, 14, 16-19 and 21 depend from independent Claims 1, 8 and 15 and recite further limitations to the claimed invention.

Applicant respectfully asserts that Bezos fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “submitting log in information to the Web site to enable editing thereof” as recited in independent Claim 1. As recited and described in the present application, log in information is submitted to the web site to enable editing thereof.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicant fails to find any teaching or suggestion in Bezos of submitting log in information to a website to enable editing thereof. The rejection states that “Bezos teaches the associate submit [sic] login information for gaining access to set up or editing [sic] his/her web site,” and cites “the associate can begin to build the content (catalog documents) of the assocaite’s web site” as teaching the claimed limitations. However, Applicant respectfully submits that merely editing a website does not teach or suggest submitting login information as claimed.

The rejection also cites to lines 61-67 of column 16 of Bezos as teaching or suggesting the submitting of log in information to the Web site to enable editing thereof as claimed. However, the mere teaching that an associate ID is assigned and emailed to an associate does not teach or suggest the submitting of log in information to the Web site to enable editing thereof as claimed. Applicants respectfully submit that an associate ID is merely a referral link that may be placed in the associate’s website (col. 10, lines 50-67). However, a

referral link inserted in the coding of a website is not the submission of login information to enable editing of the website as claimed.

Applicant respectfully submits that that Dabney, either alone or in combination with Bezos, fails to cure the deficiencies of Bezos discussed above. Specifically, Dabney also fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “submitting log in information to the Web site to enable editing thereof” as recited in independent Claim 1.

Page 3 of the rejection states that Bezos fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “receiving an updated version of the Web page to view and verify the edited item” as recited in independent Claim 1. Applicant concurs.

Applicant respectfully submits that that Dabney, either alone or in combination with Bezos, also fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “receiving an updated version of the Web page to view and verify the edited item” as recited in independent Claim 1. As recited and described in the present application, an updated version of the web page is received for verification thereof (see lines 17-23 of page 11 of the present application).

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants understands Dabney to teach reviewing updated content in an *intranet page* (col. 5, lines 31-43). However, Applicant respectfully submits that an intranet page is very different from a webpage (e.g., an *internet* webpage) as claimed. For example, Dabney makes this distinction clear in Figure 4 by showing internet 370 as separate and distinct from server 415, which Dabney indicates is an intranet (col. 8, lines 60-

62). As such, Dabney teaches away from the claimed embodiments by teaching review of an intranet page instead of verification of a webpage as claimed.

For these reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that independent Claims 1 is not rendered obvious by Bezos in view of Dabney, thereby overcoming the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of record. Since independent Claims 8 and 15 recite limitations similar to independent Claim 1, independent Claims 8 and 15 also overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of record. Since Claims 2-5, 7, 9-12, 14, 16-19 and 21 depend from and recite further limitations to the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, Claims 2-5, 7, 9-12, 14, 16-19 and 21 also overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of record. Therefore, Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-19 and 21 are allowable.

Claims 6, 13 and 20

Claims 6, 13 and 20 are rejected in the present Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being rendered obvious by Bezos in view of Dabney, and further in view of United States Patent Number 6,785,721 to Immerman et al. (hereafter referred to as "Immerman"). Applicant has reviewed the cited references and respectfully asserts that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 6, 13 and 20 are not rendered obvious by Bezos in view of Dabney and further in view of Immerman for the following reasons.

Applicant respectfully asserts that that Immerman, either alone or in combination with Bezos and/or Dabney, fails to cure the deficiencies of the cited Bezos/Dabney combination as discussed above. Specifically, Applicant respectfully asserts that Immerman also fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "submitting log in information to the Web site to enable editing thereof" as

recited in independent Claims 1, 8 and 15. Since Claims 6, 13 and 20 depend from and recite further limitations to the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, Claims 6, 13 and 20 also overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of record. Therefore, Claims 6, 13 and 20 are allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-21 are in condition for allowance and Applicant earnestly solicits such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Dated: 3/20, 2007

BMF

Bryan M. Failing
Registration No. 57,974

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060